

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
DALLAS DIVISION

JAMES BILBRO,	§	
Petitioner,	§	
	§	
v.	§	No. 3:19-cv-00246-E (BT)
	§	
DIRECTOR, TDCJ-CID,	§	
Respondent.	§	

**ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION  
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

After making an independent review of the pleadings, files and records in this case, and the Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge dated December 3, 2021, the Court finds that the Findings and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge are correct, and they are accepted as the Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation of the Court.

**IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED** that the Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge are accepted. Moreover, considering the record in this case and pursuant to [Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 22\(b\)](#), [Rule 11\(a\)](#) of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Proceedings in the United States District Court and [28 U.S.C. § 2253\(c\)](#), the Court **DENIES** a certificate of appealability. The Court adopts and incorporates by reference the Magistrate Judge's Findings, Conclusions and Recommendation filed in this case in support of its finding that the petitioner has failed to show that (1) reasonable jurists would find this Court's "assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong," or (2) reasonable jurists would find "it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right" and "debatable whether [this Court] was correct in its procedural ruling." [Slack v. McDaniel](#), 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000).

If Petitioner files a notice of appeal, he must pay the \$505.00 appellate filing fee or submit a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

**SO ORDERED** this 22nd day of December, 2021.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ada Brown', written over a horizontal line.

ADA BROWN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE